



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/063,830 | 05/16/2002 | Arthur S. Goldman | 13249 | 6259 |
| 25103 | 7590 | 10/05/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| WILSONART INTERNATIONAL INC | | | POE, MICHAEL I | |
| 505 SOUTH GENERAL BRUCE DRIVE | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| PO BOX 6110 | | | 1732 | |
| TEMPLE, TX 76503-6110 | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/063,830 | GOLDMAN ET AL. <i>KB</i> |
| | Examiner Michael I Poe | Art Unit 1732 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9,10,13 and 16-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8,11,12,14 and 15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 May 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>20040917</u> . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20020524</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

Art Unit: 1732

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's elections of Group I, claims 1-17, in the reply filed on May 20, 2004 and of Species A1, claims 8 and 15, in the reply filed on July 6, 2004 are acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the elections have been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. During a telephone conversation with applicant's attorney, John Pilarski, on September 16, 2004, a provisional election was made without traverse to further prosecute the invention of Species B1, claim 12. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. See PTOL-413B "Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary", Paper No. 20040917, for a more detailed discussion of this telephone conversation.
3. Claims 9-10, 13 and 16-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the replies filed on May 20, 2004 and July 6, 2004 and during the telephone interview on September 16, 2004.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because "temperature" is misspelled "temparature" in block number 20 of the Figure. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c))

Art Unit: 1732

so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 includes the recitation "said polyurethane foam is rigid closed-cell foam, semi-rigid closed-cell/open-cell foam **and** flexible open-cell foam". This recitation is confusing because the polyurethane foam cannot be a foam having all of the claimed structures at the same time. For the purpose of this Office action, the examiner has assumed that the polyurethane foam can have any one of the claimed structures.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,643,857 (Cousin et al.).

Claims 1-5

Cousin et al. teach a method of forming a racket frame including forming an elongate element (a preformed thermoplastic polymer extrusion) by extruding a mixture of a thermoplastic material and carbon fibres; allowing the elongate element to cool and solidify; introducing (filling) a polyurethane foam (polymer foam; polyisocyanate-based; polyurethane foam; said polyurethane foam is rigid closed-cell

Art Unit: 1732

foam, semi-rigid closed-cell/open-cell foam or flexible open-cell foam) into cavities (at least one cavity) in the elongate element; heating the elongate element with the polyurethane foam therein to its softening temperature (a first temperature; said first temperature is the heat deflection temperature of the preformed polymer extrusion) by immersing the elongate element in a thermostat-controlled bath for example of silicone oil; bending the softened elongate element (heated extrusion) as it is internally supported to prevent crushing by the polyurethane foam around a core (on a curved mandrill) to form a racket frame; and cooling the racket frame (extrusion) below its softening temperature (a second temperature) to set it into the shape of the racket frame (a curved polymer extrusion) (abstract; column 3, line 65 - column 4, line 2; column 4, line 42 - column 5, line 2; column 5, lines 63-66). Note that, although Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the polymer foam is cured within the cavities, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously recognized that the urethane foam must obviously be cured to be capable of supporting the elongate element to prevent crushing. Note further that, although Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the racket frame is removed from the core after cooling, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously recognized that the racket frame must obviously be removed from the core to formed into a racket so it can serve its intended purpose.

Claim 7

The discussion of Cousin et al. as applied to claim 1 above applies herein.

Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the polyurethane foam has a density of about 16 kg per cubic meter to about 320 kg per cubic meter. However, Cousin et al. further teach the cavities are filled with a polyurethane foam whose density is chosen in dependence on the final weight the racket is to have (column 3, line 65 - column 4, line 2). Since Cousin et al. recognize that the density of the foam is chosen based upon the desired weight of the racket, Cousin et al. recognize that the density of the foam is a result-effective. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum density of the foam in the process of Cousin et al. through routine experimentation based upon the desired final weight of the racket, the racket construction, etc.

Art Unit: 1732

9. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,643,857 (Cousin et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,525,319 (Kaspe).

Claim 6

The discussion of Cousin et al. as applied to claim 1 above applies herein.

Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the second temperature is at least about 10 degrees Celsius less than the heat deflection temperature (e.g., the softening temperature) of the elongate element. However, Kaspe teaches a method for forming a single flange pipe adapter including softening the end portion of a resin pipe, bending the outer extremities of the heated end portion to cause the heated end portion to be flared outwardly, and cooling the outwardly flared end portion to set it in its final configuration wherein the temperature and the timing of the heating and cooling vary depending on the nature and/or thickness of the thermoplastic resin used (column 1, line 47 - column 2, line 2; column 3, lines 33-39 and 48-61). Although Kaspe does not teach the specifically claimed cooling temperature, Kaspe obviously recognizes that the temperature and the timing of heating and cooling are result-effective variable based upon the nature of the thermoplastic resin used in bending processes for thermoplastic materials. As such, in view of the teachings of Kaspe, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum temperature and timing of heating and cooling in the process of Cousin et al. through routine experimentation based upon the composition, thickness and nature of the thermoplastic material used for the racket frame.

Claim 8

The discussion of Cousin et al. as applied to claim 1 above applies herein.

Although Cousin et al. teach that the elongate element can be heated by a bath of desired temperature, Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the bath may be a glycol bath. Kaspe further teach that heating in a glycol bath or other baths such as oil baths have been suitable for heating the end portion of the pipe (said extrusion is heated to said first temperature in a glycol bath). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use a glycol bath in the process of Cousin et al. instead of the silicone oil bath as taught by Kaspe to provide a cheaper and more efficient heating medium for the bath in the process of Cousin et al.

Art Unit: 1732

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,643,857 (Cousin et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,385,963 (McBain et al.).

Claim 11

The discussion of Cousin et al. as applied to claim 1 above applies herein.

Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the thermoplastic material may be a vinyl polymer. However, McBain et al. teach a modified unsaturated polyester or vinyl ester composition (a vinyl polymer) that can be utilized as automotive structural components such as load bearing support members, air craft components, housing for various electrical and household goods, sporting goods such as golf club shafts, rackets, etc. (column 21, lines 13-19). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use a vinyl ester composition as the thermoplastic material in the process of Cousin et al. as taught by McBain et al. to provide a racket frame having higher flexural strain to failure as taught by McBain et al.

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,643,857 (Cousin et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,164,419 (Bartlett et al.).

Claim 12

The discussion of Cousin et al. as applied to claim 1 above applies herein.

Although Cousin et al. teach filling the cavities by injection of a polyurethane foam from a mixing head, Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the polyurethane foam comprises polyisocyanate, at least one active hydrogen-containing compound, and a blowing agent. However, Bartlett et al. teach that it is well known to prepare polyurethane foams by reacting organic polyisocyanate with an active hydrogen-containing compound in the presence of a blowing agent or agents (a plurality of ingredients comprising polyisocyanate, at least one active hydrogen-containing compound and a blowing agent) (column 2, lines 30-46). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the well known process of preparing a polyurethane foam in the process of Cousin et al. as taught by Bartlett et al. to provide a reliable and readily available method of forming the polyurethane foam in the process of Cousin et al.

Art Unit: 1732

12. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,643,857 (Cousin et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,385,963 (McBain et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 4,525,319 (Kaspe).

Claim 14

Cousin et al. teach a method of forming a racket frame including forming an elongate element (a preformed extrusion) by extruding a mixture of a thermoplastic material and carbon fibres; allowing the elongate element to cool and solidify; introducing (filling) a polyurethane foam into cavities (at least one cavity) in the elongate element; heating the elongate element with the polyurethane foam therein to its softening temperature by immersing the elongate element in a thermostat-controlled bath for example of silicone oil; bending the softened elongate element (heated extrusion) as it is internally supported to prevent crushing by the polyurethane foam around a core (on a curved mandrill) to form a racket frame; and cooling the racket frame (extrusion) below its softening temperature to set it into the shape of the racket frame (a curved polymer extrusion) (abstract; column 3, line 65 - column 4, line 2; column 4, line 42 - column 5, line 2; column 5, lines 63-66). Note that, although Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the urethane foam is cured within the cavities, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously recognized that the urethane foam must obviously be cured to be capable of supporting the elongate element to prevent crushing. Note further that, although Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the racket frame is removed from the core after cooling, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously recognized that the racket frame must obviously be removed from the core to formed into a racket so it can serve its intended purpose.

Cousin et al. do not specifically teach that the thermoplastic material may be a vinyl polymer. However, McBain et al. teach a modified unsaturated polyester or vinyl ester composition (a vinyl polymer) that can be utilized as automotive structural components such as load bearing support members, air craft components, housing for various electrical and household goods, sporting goods such as golf club shafts, rackets, etc. (column 21, lines 13-19). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use a vinyl ester composition as the thermoplastic material in the process of Cousin et al. as

Art Unit: 1732

taught by McBain et al. to provide a racket frame having higher flexural strain to failure as taught by McBain et al.

Cousin et al. in view of McBain et al. do not specifically teach that heating the extrusion to about 70 degrees Celsius and cooling the extrusion to a temperature less than about 60 degrees Celsius. However, Kaspe teaches a method for forming a single flange pipe adapter including softening the end portion of a resin pipe, bending the outer extremities of the heated end portion to cause the heated end portion to be flared outwardly, and cooling the outwardly flared end portion to set it in its final configuration wherein the temperature and the timing of the heating and cooling vary depending on the nature and/or thickness of the thermoplastic resin used (column 1, line 47 - column 2, line 2; column 3, lines 33-39 and 48-61). Although Kaspe does not teach the specifically claimed heating and cooling temperatures, Kaspe obviously recognizes that the temperature and the timing of heating and cooling are result-effective variable based upon the nature of the thermoplastic resin used in bending processes for thermoplastic materials. As such, in view of the teachings of Kaspe, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum temperature and timing of heating and cooling in the process of Cousin et al. in view of McBain et al. through routine experimentation based upon the composition, thickness and nature of the vinyl polymer used for the racket frame.

Claim 15

The discussion of Cousin et al., Kaspe and McBain et al. as applied to claim 14 above applies herein.

Although Cousin et al. in view of McBain et al. teach that the elongate element can be heated by a bath of desired temperature, Cousin et al. in view of McBain et al. do not specifically teach that the bath may be a glycol bath. Kaspe further teach that heating in a glycol bath or other baths such as oil baths have been suitable for heating the end portion of the pipe (said extrusion is heated to said first temperature in a glycol bath). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use a glycol bath in the process of Cousin et al. in view of McBain et al. instead of the silicone oil bath as taught by Kaspe to provide a cheaper and more efficient heating medium for the bath in the process of Cousin et al. in view of McBain et al.

Art Unit: 1732

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 3,068,136 (Reid), U.S. Patent No. 3,553,301 (Reardon et al.), U.S. Patent No. 4,460,423 (Bosnia) and U.S. Patent No. 5,900,299 (Wynne) have been cited of interest to show the state of the art at the time the invention was made.
14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael I Poe whose telephone number is (571) 272-1207. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Michael Poe/mip



MICHAEL P. COLAIANNI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER